

dispensary is treating people, in greater or less numbers, who could and should pay physicians' fees. But that has nothing to do with wholesale abuses that could and should be stopped. The argument made by our correspondent to the effect that the University of California Hospital "is taking money out of the pockets of physicians" by competing with hospitals owned by physicians, is too lame for serious discussion. That is purely and simply competition on commercial ground; if a physician starts a private hospital it is his venture in commercialism—he is doing business—has become a business man subject to business or commercial competition; the running of a hospital for a profit is in no way a part of the liberal profession of medicine. In the case of the particular hospital mentioned, it is not a commercial enterprise; it is not founded for nor to be operated for the purpose of making money. If one enters here and pays fees, what he pays goes to help in maintaining the hospital for the use of those who cannot pay. Furthermore, the University of California Hospital and the Lane Hospital give back to the people of the state a large return; they are teaching institutions and they aid vastly in the training of our medical students. Where does the medical world profit—and through it all the people—from the immense amount of material that is passing through the German Hospital and its ilk? Occasionally some member of the staff of such an institution makes individual contribution to medical knowledge; but this is rare; in the main, it is wasted.

Nobody took much interest in the presidential election, but a good many people were very much interested in the campaign of  
**ELECTION RESULTS.** Hughes of New York. The people won. Probably of next importance was the judiciary contest in San Francisco. An honest judge was elected, against almost impossible odds, and one who had lost the confidence of the people was defeated. Occasionally we contemplate the spectacle of the average citizen yawning, stretching himself and getting up to go out and vote; and then he lapses once more into troubled somnolence. But the "machine" never sleeps; and so, never has to rouse itself. It works all the time; and thus it gets what it wants and the "average citizen" rubs his eyes, when it is all over, and wonders how it happened—or else swears at the "machine" instead of at himself. Let us thank the good Lord that the "machine" is no more grasping than it is, for we are at its mercy.

The many reviews and published reports of the recent International Tuberculosis Congress but accentuate the utter impossibility of completely presenting the results of such a large and unwieldy aggregation. There is no point of perspective. Viewed broadly, the Congress was an immense success from the sociologic point of view. It attracted the notice and the attention of millions of people to preventive work

in tuberculosis. Most of the countries of the world were spurred to extra work on this particular subject, and even our own national government actually produced some matters which will tend to favorably affect public health—a thing almost unprecedented (of course excepting the work of the U. S. P. H. & M. H. S.): Many thousands of people were attracted to the exhibits and doubtless some few learned that it is no actual loss in dollars and cents to provide their tenants with sufficient light and air. In all the sections was a singular unanimity of expression of the all important necessity of educating the public, which may be taken as the key note of the congress. Much space has been given to the contention between Koch and everybody else; in nearly all the journals, and the subject seems hardly worth it. Were Koch a less notable figure, were it not for the fact that he discovered the bacillus tuberculosis, no great amount of attention would have been given to this difference of opinion. Twice has he changed his mind and he may do so many times again; that will in no way affect the facts that are known or will be discovered. Discussion upon matters of mere opinion is a sad waste of time. Furthermore, it is immaterial whether the bovine bacillus produces pulmonary consumption in man or not; it is admitted that it does produce other forms of the disease in man, and all are equally undesirable. Tubercle bacilli in milk do not make it more appetizing. A tempest in a tea pot, forsooth. If a man is right, time will prove it; if he is wrong, the fact will in due course be known, and this whether the whole world is with him or against him.

For the first time in the history of the state, if we are correctly informed, a physician has got out an injunction to prevent a committee on ethics of a medical society from investigating charges made against him. In San Francisco, it is reported, Dr. Canac-Marquis was charged with having agreed to and attempted to perform an abortion. The matter was referred in the regular way to the committee on ethics and the doctor was duly notified. He immediately went into court and asked that the committee be enjoined from interrogating witnesses or in any way proceeding with the investigation. Owing to faulty wording of the by-laws and to the fact that the charges were not correctly presented, the injunction was made permanent. What will happen next?

We are beginning to hear quite a little of the serum diagnosis of syphilis, though it is as yet a very long way from being an everyday possibility. Nevertheless,  
**DIAGNOSIS OF SYPHILIS.** as a definite scientific advance it seems to have passed the stage of question and is to be accepted as a fact. The Wassermann method, so-called, which is based upon hemolysis, is, for practical purposes, impossible. It is quite possible, however, that the serum method of Fornet and others will subsequently be